NOV - 5 1992

BEFORE THE FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20554

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY ORIGINAL FILE

ĪΝ	THE	MA	TTER	OF
118	I Dr.	IVIA	VII E.K.	(JF

REVISIONS OF PART 22 OF THE COMMISSION'S RULES GOVERNING THE PUBLIC MOBILE SERVICES

CC DOCKET No. 92-115

Reply Comments of the Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association

1. The Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association ("CTIA") submits these brief reply comments in response to three issues raised in the initial comments. The first issue we address is Telocator's proposal that amnesty should be offered to existing licensees to correct records at the Commission. Comments of Telocator, CC Docket No. 92-115, filed October 5, 1992, at 13. We agree with Telocator that extending amnesty to licensees who voluntarily correct mistakes in their authorizations or Commission filings is in the public interest since providing an incentive to correct the Commission's records will contribute to the efficient operation of the licensing process and the quality of the service provided to the public. It is not clear from Telocator's comments, however, whether its amnesty proposal was raised in connection with just paging alone or for both paging and cellular licensees. CTIA believes that affording amnesty to cellular licensees would afford the same benefits. Inasmuch as licensee

amnesty will facilitate the correction of Commission records, offering it to cellular as well as paging licensees is clearly in the public interest.

- 2. Applicants Against Lottery Abuses ("AALA") argue that the Commission should not adopt blanket limits on payments for the withdrawal of petitions to deny or the dismissal of applications. Comments of the AALA, CC Docket No. 92-115, filed October 5, 1992, at 5. CTIA continues to support the adoption of proposed rule section 22.129, limiting payments to parties for withdrawing petitions to deny and mutually exclusive applications. AALA opposes this limitation arguing that it "removes the incentive for private parties to undertake the necessary and often substantial task of assisting the Commission in policing lottery abuses." AALA Comments at iii. This argument does not reflect reality. Over the past several years, the ability to profit through the filing of spurious applications and petitions has provided no significant benefit to the Commission or the public. AALA's suggested alternative of taking each settlement on a case by case basis would leave the former rule in place and do nothing to discourage nuisance filings. Moreover, such an approach is much too costly and inefficient given the Commission's other obligations and its current budget limitations on staffing. For these reasons AALA's opposition to the proposed limitation should be rejected.
- 3. The third and final issue is the opposition by the United States Telephone Association ("USTA") to eliminating the restriction that limits fixed cellular service to Basic Exchange Telephone Radio Service ("BETRS"). Comments of USTA, CC Docket No. 92-115, filed October 5, 1992, at 6. USTA argues that by removing the restriction the Commission has blurred the distinction between mobile radio and local exchange services. It contends that by eliminating the need for a waiver for non-BETRS technology, the Commission has precluded its

own ability and that of the states to monitor those carriers electing to offer fixed services through cellular frequencies. It argues that such an action is an abdication of the Commission's responsibility to assess spectrum usage and competitive market impacts as well as an infringement upon state authority.

- 4. There are a number of reasons USTA's opposition should be rejected. First, USTA's position would inhibit the efficient use of scarce spectrum by restricting the spectrum's use without regard to the public's needs and the demands of the market place. The Commission would be irresponsible if it allocated spectrum and then restricted licensees from responding to market driven needs and practical efficiencies. Second, the blurring distinction between mobile radio services and local exchange services that USTA complains of is occurring because technology is evolving so rapidly, not because of the proposed change in the Commission's rules. USTA apparently would prefer to freeze progress and sacrifice efficiency to preserve the status quo. The proposed rule does nothing to redefine local exchange or mobile radio service, the rule merely allows cellular carriers to provide service to the public in the most efficient manner possible.
- 5. Finally, every one of USTA's arguments support the elimination of fixed service on cellular frequencies in any form, even through BETRS. The Commission, however, has found BETRS to serve the public interest, and in authorizing the use of BETRS operations, explicitly recognized that any form of fixed or mobile service operation on cellular frequencies would be acceptable as long as they were offered in conformance with the conventional cellular technical standards. Amendment of Parts 2 and 22 of the Commission's Rules to Permit Liberalization of Technology and Auxiliary Service Offerings in the Domestic Public Cellular Radio

<u>Telecommunications Service</u>, 5 FCC Rcd 1138, 1139 (1990). USTA now apparently seeks to revisit that conclusion. The instant proceeding, however, is not the appropriate mechanism for such a reconsideration. Consequently, for all these reasons, the Commission should adopt the new rule as proposed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association

Michael Altschul General Counsel

Jack W. Whitley

Director of Regulatory Affairs

November 5, 1992 1133 21st Street, N.W. Suite 300 Washington, D.C. 20036 I, Darren LaPorte, with the Cellular Telecommunications Industry Association, do hereby certify that on this 5th day of November, 1992 a copy of the foregoing "Reply Comments" was sent to each of the following by first-class mail.

arren LaPorte

James D. Ellis
'illiam J. Free
bouthwestern Bell Corporation
One Bell Center, Room 3524
St. Louis, MO 63101-3099

Dr. George L. Schrenk COMP COMM 900 Haddon Avenue, 4th Floor Collingswood, NJ 08108

Edward R. Wholl Stephen B. Wiznitzer NYNEX 2000 Corporate Drive Orangeburg, NY 10962 Gerald S. McGowan Marjorie Giller Spivak Lukas, McGowan, Nace & Gutierrez 1819 H Street, NW, 7th Floor Washington, D.C. 20006

Richard S. Rodin Karis A. Hastings Hogan and Hartson 555 13th Street, NW Washington, D.C. 20004 Carl W. Northrop Bryan Cave 700 13th Street, NW, Ste 700 Washington, DC 20005

Judith St. Ledger-Roty
Marnie K. Sarver
Reed, Smith, Shaw & McClay
1200 18th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20036

Jack Whitley CTIA 1133 21st Street, N.W., Third Floor Washington, D.C. 20036

Eliot Greenwald Scott R. Flick Fisher, Wayland, Cooper & Leader 1255 23rd St, NW, Ste 800 Washington, D.C. 20037 Daniel L. Bart CTE Corporation 1850 M Street, NW, Ste 1200 Washington, D.C. 20036 Richard L. Biby Communications Engineering Services P.C. 6105-G Arlington Boulevard Falls Church, VA 22044

Mark Hamilton
Cathleen A. Massey
McCaw Cellular Communications
1250 Connecticut Ave, NW, Ste 401
Washington, D.C. 20036

Steve Dussek
David Aas
McCaw Cellular Communications
Paging Division
12112 115th Avenue, N.E.
Kirkland, WA 98034

Robert M. Jackson
Blooston, Mordkofsky, Jackson &
Dickens
2120 L Street, NW, Ste 300
Washington, D.C. 20037

Leon T. Knauer Kathryn A. Zachem Wilkinson, Barker, Knauer & Quinn 1735 New York Ave, NW Washington, D.C. 20006

William F. Franklin
Pepper & Corazzini
1776 K Street, N.W.
200 Montgomery Building
Washington, D.C. 20006

Thomas P. Kerester Chief Counsel Office of Advocacy U.S. Small Business Administration 409 3rd Street, S.W. Washington, D.C. 20416

Michael W. Mowery PacTel Cellular 2999 Oak Road, MS 800 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 Richard C. Nelson Director-Regulatory PacTel Corporation 2999 Oak Road, MS 1050 Walnut Creek, CA 94596 James P. Tuthill
Lucille M. Mates
Pacific Bell/Nevada Bell
140 New Montgomery Street, Room 1526
San Francisco, CA 94105

James L. Wurtz Pacific Bell/Nevada Bell 1275 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Washington, D.C. 20004

R. Michael Senkowski David Hilliard Wiley, Rein & Fielding 1776 K Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20006 Thomas J. Casey Jay L. Birnbaum Skadden, Arps, Slate, Meagher and Flom 1440 New York Ave, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20005

Thomas Gutierrez
J.Justin McClure
Lukas, McGowan, Nace and Gutierrez
1819 H Street, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20006

John T. Scott III Linda K. Smith Crowell and Moring 1001 Pennsylvania Ave, NW Washington, D.C. 20004

S. Mark Tuller Vice President and General Counsel Bell Atlantic Mobile Systems 180 Washington Valley Road Bedminster, NJ 07921 Kevin C. Gallagher Vice President-Legal/External Affairs Centel Cellular Company 8725 West Higgins Road, Ste 330 Chicago, IL 60631

frederick M. Joyce Christine McLaughlin Joyce and Jacobs 2300 M St, NW, 8th Floor Washington, D.C. 20037 Martin T. McCue General Counsel USTA 900 19th Street, NW, Ste 800 Washington, D.C. 20006 Louise Cybulski Pepper & Corazzini 776 K Street, NW 200 Montgomery Building Washington, D.C. 20006 Louis R. du Treil du Treil, Lundin & Rackley 1019 19th St, N.W., 3rd Floor Washington, D.C. 20036

Richard C. Rowlenson Sr. Vice President & General Counsel Vanguard Cellular Systems 2002 Pisgah Church Rd, Ste. 300 Greensboro, NC 27408 William Barfield
Dave G. Richards
BellSouth Corporation
1155 Peachtree St, NE, Ste 1800
Atlanta, GA 30367-6000

Tom W. Davidson
Paul S. Pien
Akin, Gump, Hauer & Feld
1333 New Hampshire Ave, NW, Ste 400
Washington, D.C. 20036

Carolyn C. Hill Federal Regulatory Counsel ALLTEL Service Corp. 1710 Rhode Island Ave, NW Ste 1000 Washington, D.C. 20036

James F. Rogers
Roaymond B. Growchowski
Latham & Watkins
1001 Pennsylvania Ave, NW, Ste 1300
Washington, D.C. 20004

Harold Mordkofsky John A. Prendergast Blooston, Mordkofsky, Jackson & Dickens 2120 L Street, NW, Ste 300 Washington, DC 20037

Rodney L. Joyce Ann Bavender Ginsburg, Feldman & Bress 1250 Connecticut Ave, NW Washington, D.C. 20036 Jack Taylor International Mobile Machines Corp. 6116 Brassie Way Redding, CA 96003